arXiv:0710.2389v2 [quant-ph] 16 Oct 2007

Entanglement of formation from optimal decomposition

Lin Chen and Yi-Xin Chen
Zhejiang Insitute of Modern Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China

We present a new method of analytically deriving the entanglement of formation of the bipartite mixed state. The method realizes the optimal decomposition families of states. Our method can lead to many new results concerning entanglement of formation, its additivity and entanglement cost. We illustrate it by investigating the two-qubit state, the separable state, the maximally correlated state, the isotropic state and the Werner state.

The rapid progress in quantum information theory (QIT) has made the entanglement the key resource in quantum mechanics. One of the most fundamental questions in QIT is how to quantitatively describe the entanglement by entanglement measures [1].

The main proposed entanglement measures so far include the entanglement of formation (EOF) E_f (and the corresponding asymptotic generalization, the entanglement cost E_c) and distillable entanglement E_d [2]. They respectively present the entanglement of a state in terms of EPR pairs that is required to create it and that can be extracted from it. All the measures are equivalent to the von Neumann entropy $E(|\psi\rangle) = S(\text{Tr}_A|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}\rho \log\rho$ for pure bipartite states [3].

The analytical calculation of entanglement measures is important. The entanglement measure quantifies the quantum correlation in the state used for any quantum-information task, e.g., an EPR pair is both sufficient and necessary for quantum teleporation. A straight way to prove an important conjecture that the formation of mixed entanglement is irreversible [4, 5], is to calculate the entanglement cost and distillable entanglement. If the conjecture is true, it will mean that the mixed entanglement manipulation is irreversible under local operations and classical communications (LOCC) [6]. On the experimental side, there has been recent methods of estimating entanglement measures like the EOF [7]. Entanglement measures have been also shown to be useful in many other fields such as quantum phase transition, spin-boson model and optical lattices [8].

Despite the importance of entanglement measures, it is very difficult to derive their analytical expressions for mixed bipartite states by reason of the involved optimization problem. Main progress was made in the derivation of EOF [9, 10, 11]. There are also a few results on entanglement cost [12, 13, 14] and distillable entanglement [12, 15].

In this Letter we derive the EOF by means of the optimal decomposition (OD) of states. We show that a known OD from a state always leads to an OD family containing infinite number of states, and the EOF of any state in it is computable. Next, new OD families can be derived from the tensor product of OD families with additive EOF, so we can continue to generate states with computable EOF. Differing with the former skills, our method mostly computes the EOF of states which are not symmetric and whose subsystems have different dimensions. It greatly enlarges the family of states whose EOF is computable and additive. Moreover, Our method can evaluate the entanglement cost for many states, while the latter is important but very difficult to compute so far. The new results on additivity of EOF help get insight into the classical capacity of quantum channels [16].

We give the method of finding out the OD of a state with known EOF. We determine the ODs of rank-2 two-qubit states with additive EOF and two important states in QIT, the Werner state [17] and the isotropic state [18]. We describe how the ODs of these states lead to computable EOF and entanglement cost when the EOF is additive. We propose the schemes for experimentally generating the Werner state and checking the EOF. The separable states and maximally correlated (MC) states of arbitrary dimension, whose EOF turns out to be additive, are also analyzed. They provide strong evidence that the entanglement cost is strictly larger than the distillable entanglement.

Let us start by recalling the definition of EOF. A mixed state $\rho = \sum_i p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ can be prepared in many ways of ensembles of pure states $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$. The EOF for ρ is defined in the way such that

$$E_f(\rho) = \min_{\{p_i,|\psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i E(|\psi_i\rangle). \quad (1)$$

Suppose the ensemble $\{q_i, |\phi_i\rangle, \forall q_i > 0\}$ realize the EOF and it thus constitutes the OD of ρ. By randomly changing the probabilities, we refer to the set of states ε_ρ constituted by the ensemble $\{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle, \forall r_i \geq 0\}$ as the OD family of ρ. That is, a state $\sigma \in \varepsilon_\rho$ if and only if $\sigma = \sum_i r_i|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|, r_i \geq 0$. For simplicity, we denote $\varepsilon_\rho = \{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$ or $\varepsilon_\rho = \{r_0, r_1, ..., |\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, ...\}$ throughout the paper. The EOF of any state in an OD family is computable [11], namely $E_f(\sigma) = \sum_i r_i E(|\phi_i\rangle)$. In addition, the subset of an OD family is also an OD family.

On the other hand, the OD family is closely connected to the additivity of EOF of ρ. The latter means for any bipartite state σ, it holds that $E_f(\rho\otimes\sigma) = E_f(\rho)+E_f(\sigma)$. The problem that whether EOF is additive is important [19], for it will lead to the equation $E_f = E_c$. The following facts easily follow from the definition of additivity.

Lemma 1. (1) The EOF of any state in the OD family of ρ is additive if the EOF of ρ is additive; (2) If the EOF of two states are additive, then the EOF of their tensor product is additive.

Proof. (1) Let the OD family of ρ be $\varepsilon_\rho = \{r_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$. We are always able to write $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i$, with each state $\rho_i \in \varepsilon_\rho$ and $\forall p_i > 0$. For any state σ we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_f(\rho) + E_f(\sigma) &= \sum_i p_i (E_f(\rho_i) + E_f(\sigma)) \\ &\geq \sum_i p_i E_f(\rho_i \otimes \sigma) \geq E_f(\rho \otimes \sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we have used the fact that the EOF is subadditive and convex [1] in the inequalities. Because $E_f(\rho)$ is additive and the state ρ_i is arbitrary, we conclude that the EOF of any state in ε_ρ is also additive.

(2) Suppose $E_f(\rho_1)$ and $E_f(\rho_2)$ are additive. For any state σ, it holds that $E_f(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \sigma) = E_f(\rho_1) + E_f(\rho_2 \otimes \sigma) = E_f(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) + E_f(\sigma)$. So the EOF of the tensor state $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ is additive. This completes the proof.

Proposition 1. Let $\varepsilon_{\rho_1} = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$ and $\varepsilon_{\rho_2} = \{q_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$ be two OD families and at least one of $E_f(\rho_1)$ and $E_f(\rho_2)$ be additive. Then the set $\varepsilon_\sigma = \{r_{ij}, |\psi_i \phi_j\rangle\}$ is an OD family. If both of $E_f(\rho_1)$ and $E_f(\rho_2)$ are additive, then the EOF of any state $\sigma' \in \varepsilon_\sigma$ is additive.

Proof. Suppose the ODs of the states ρ_1 and ρ_2 are constituted by the ensembles $\{p'_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$ and $\{q'_i, |\phi_i\rangle\}$, respectively. The OD of the tensor state $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ is then constituted by the ensembles $\{p'_i q'_j, |\psi_i \phi_j\rangle\}$ because of $E_f(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = E_f(\rho_1) + E_f(\rho_2)$. This makes the set $\varepsilon_\sigma = \varepsilon_{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2} = \{r_{ij}, |\psi_i \phi_j\rangle\}$ an OD family, too. When $E_f(\rho_1)$ and $E_f(\rho_2)$ are additive, equivalently $E_f(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)$ is additive by (2) in lemma 1, the fact that the EOF of any state $\sigma' \in \varepsilon_\sigma$ is additive is immediately derived from (1) in lemma 1. ■

Proposition 1 is very useful for entanglement measures. In the following text the known EOF of the states ρ_i's on the spaces $H_{A_i} \otimes H_{B_i}$'s respectively, helps generate the OD families $\varepsilon_{\rho_i} = \{p_{ij}, |\phi_{ij}\rangle\}$'s such that the EOF of any state $\sigma_i \in \varepsilon_{\rho_i}$ is computable; that is, $E_f(\sigma_i) = \sum_j p_{ij} E(|\phi_{ij}\rangle)$. Our method indeed generates a family of states with computable EOF by using only a state with known EOF. When $E_f(\sigma_i)$ is additive for some state σ_i, by proposition 1 we can generate the new OD families $\varepsilon_{\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j} = \{p_{ijk}, |\phi_{ik}\rangle|\phi_{jk}\rangle\}$ on the space $H_{A_i A_j} \otimes H_{B_i B_j}$ and the EOF of any state $\sigma_{ij} \in \varepsilon_{\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j}$ similarly reads $E_f(\sigma_{ij}) = \sum_k p_{ijk} E(|\phi_{ik}\rangle|\phi_{jk}\rangle)$. In the same vein, we can generate more OD families $\varepsilon_{\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_k}$ on the space $H_{A_i A_j \ldots A_k} \otimes H_{B_i B_j \ldots B_k}$ and calculate the EOF of states in it. When $E_f(\sigma_i), E_f(\sigma_j), ..., E_f(\sigma_k)$ are additive, by proposition 1 they will lead to new states whose EOF is additive and thus the computable entanglement cost.

For example, we consider the two-qubit MC state

$$\rho_{p,\theta} = p|\psi_\theta\rangle\langle\psi_\theta| + (1-p)|\psi_{\pi/2-\theta}\rangle\langle\psi_{\pi/2-\theta}|, \quad (3)$$

where $|\psi_\theta\rangle = \cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$ and $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, ...$ are computational basis. It follows from [9, 13] that $E_f(\rho_{p,\theta}) = E_c(\rho_{p,\theta}) = h(\cos^2\theta)$ with the function $h(x)$ being the binary entropy function. So the set $\varepsilon_{\rho_{p,\theta}} = \{p, 1-p, |\psi_\theta\rangle, |\psi_{\pi/2-\theta}\rangle\}$ is an OD family. Thus by proposition 1 we can compute the EOF and entanglement cost for any state ρ in the OD family $\varepsilon_{\rho_{p_1,\theta_1} \otimes \rho_{p_2,\theta_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{p_n,\theta_n}} = \{p_1, p_2, ..., p_{2^n}, |\psi_{\theta_1}\psi_{\theta_2}...\psi_{\theta_n}\rangle, |\psi_{\pi/2-\theta_1}\psi_{\theta_2}...\psi_{\theta_n}\rangle, ..., |\psi_{\pi/2-\theta_1}\psi_{\pi/2-\theta_2}...\psi_{\pi/2-\theta_n}\rangle\}$, namely $E_f(\rho) = E_c(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n h(\cos^2\theta_i)$. Remarkably, the EOF of different states in the OD family do not change with the probability distributions. So we have proposed a new family of MC states and thus $E_f(\rho)$ is additive. As the distillable entanglement of the MC state is computable [15], we thus obtain that the difference between the entanglement cost and distillable entanglement of $\rho \in \varepsilon_{\rho_{p_1,\theta_1} \otimes \rho_{p_2,\theta_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{p_n,\theta_n}}$ on the space $H_A \otimes H_B$ is

$$E_c(\rho) - E_d(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n h(\cos^2\theta_i) - S(\mathrm{Tr}_A \rho) + S(\rho). \quad (4)$$

This expression indeed represents the entanglement that cannot be distilled from the state ρ under LOCC [2]. When the conjecture that Eqs. (4) is strictly larger than zero is true, it will mean the asymptotic entanglement manipulation of ρ is irreversible, which is essentially different from the case of pure states [3]. Much numerical calculation has been done and they supported the conjecture. Furthermore, it turns out to be true by plotting Eqs. (4), when the number of parameters in ρ is less.

Similarly one can verify a more general two-qubit OD family $\varepsilon_\sigma = \{q, 1-q, \sqrt{p}\cos\theta|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}\sin\theta(x|00\rangle + y|01\rangle + z|11\rangle), \sqrt{p}\sin\theta|00\rangle - \sqrt{1-p}\cos\theta(x|00\rangle + y|01\rangle + z|11\rangle)\}$ up to the normalization factors, $p, x, y, z \in [0,1], x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1$ and $\tan\theta = \frac{-1+2(1-p)x^2 - \sqrt{1+4(1-p)^2(x^4-x^2)}}{2x\sqrt{p-p^2}}$. The EOF of any state in ε_σ is equal to $h(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-4(1-p)^2x^2z^2})$ and it is additive [13]. As the state $\rho_{p,\theta}$ in Eqs. (3) belongs to ε_σ, the newly constituted OD family $\varepsilon_{\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_n}$ provides more states ρ whose EOF is computable and additive, namely $E_f(\rho) = E_c(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n h(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-4(1-p_i)^2 x_i^2 z_i^2})$. Generally, [9] has given a programmable way to find out the OD of any two-qubit state ρ. It provides abundant resource for the generation of new OD families, in which the EOF of the states is computable by proposition 1.

In this case, we can obtain more states with computable EOF by mixing ε_ρ with other OD families, e.g., the family ε_s consisting of all separable states ρ_s. As the entanglement cannot be increased under LOCC and thus $E_f(\rho \otimes \rho_s) \geq E_f(\rho)$, it then follows from the subadditivity of EOF that

Lemma 2. The EOF of any state $\rho \in \varepsilon_s$ is additive. The set of separable states ε_s is an OD family. ■

Although the separable state is classically established [17], we emphasize that lemma 2 is by no means a trivial result. We consider the 4×4 state σ in the OD family $\{p, 1-p, |00\rangle|\psi_\theta\rangle, \frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}|\psi_{\pi/2-\theta}\rangle\}$ [20], which is a subset of the OD family $\varepsilon_{\rho_s\otimes\rho_{p,\theta}}$. So we get that $E_f(\sigma) = E_c(\sigma) = h(\cos^2\theta)$ and it is additive. However, these results cannot be derived from any existing theory since the partial trace over a system of σ does not equal to an entanglement-breaking channel [13]. In addition, the tag states $|00\rangle$ and $\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ cannot be explicitly distinguished [12]. Generally given an OD family $\varepsilon_\rho = \{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$, by proposition 1 one can always constitute the new OD family $\varepsilon_{\rho_s\otimes\rho} = \{p_i, |\phi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle\}$ with each state $|\phi_i\rangle$ in randomly product form. The EOF of any state $\sigma \in \varepsilon_{\rho_s\otimes\rho}$ thus reads $E_f(\sigma) = \sum_i p_i E(|\psi_i\rangle)$. This value will coincide with $E_c(\sigma)$ when $E_f(\rho)$ is additive.

We have known that the OD of the two-qubit state ρ is constituted by pure states with identical amount of entanglement [9]. However it is not the case for states of high dimensions, as the following example illustrates. Suppose $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i|ii\rangle, |\phi\rangle = (\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} c_i^2)^{-1/2}\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} c_i|ii\rangle, \cos\theta = (\sum_{i=0}^{f-1} c_i^2)^{1/2}, \sin\theta = (\sum_{i=f}^{d-1} c_i^2)^{1/2}, u_{00} = -u_{11} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{-1+p+p\cos 2\theta}{2\sqrt{1-p^2\sin^2 2\theta}}}, u_{01} = u_{10} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{-1+p+p\cos 2\theta}{2\sqrt{1-p^2\sin^2 2\theta}}}, \forall c_i > 0, d > f$, we have

Lemma 3. Consider the MC state $\rho = p|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-p)|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$. The OD and EOF of ρ respectively read $\sum_{i=0}^{1}(u_{i0}\sqrt{p}|\psi\rangle + u_{i1}\sqrt{1-p}|\phi\rangle)(u_{i0}\sqrt{p}\langle\psi| + u_{i1}\sqrt{1-p}\langle\phi|)$ and

$$E_f(\rho) = -p\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i^2\log c_i^2 - (1-p)\sum_{i=0}^{f-1}\tfrac{c_i^2}{\cos^2\theta}\log\tfrac{c_i^2}{\cos^2\theta}$$
$$+h\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-p^2\sin^2 2\theta}\big) - p\,h(\cos^2\theta). \qquad (5)$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of EOF [9] that

$$E_f(\rho) = \min_{\vec{v}_0,\vec{v}_1}\sum_i q_i E\left(\frac{v_{i0}\sqrt{p}|\psi\rangle + v_{i1}\sqrt{1-p}|\phi\rangle}{\sqrt{q_i}}\right), \quad (6)$$

where $[v_{ij}] = [\vec{v}_0, \vec{v}_1]$ are the first two columns of a unitary matrix and $\sqrt{q_i}$ is the normalization factor. Notice every decomposition of ρ is expressed in Eqs. (6) owing to the linear independence of $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$. Reduction of Eqs. (6) leads to the optimization problem equivalent to that for the two-qubit MC state, whose entanglement has been derived by [9]. One can check that the entanglement of the proposed OD of ρ coincides with $E_f(\rho)$. ∎

Lemma 3 actually provides a new family of MC states with computable EOF. One can easily check that the amounts of entanglement contained in the two pure states constituting ε_ρ are always not equal, which totally differs with the OD families of two-qubit states and separable states. It thus by proposition 1 generates new OD family $\varepsilon_{\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\rho_n}$ in which the pure states have different entanglement, correspondingly the states in $\varepsilon_{\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\rho_n}$ are not equally entangled when the probability distributions change. So this OD family generates more complex states with computable entanglement cost. Of course more OD families can be produced by using the results on two-qubit states and separable states.

Next, we show that there is indeed a gap between the distillable entanglement and entanglement cost for ρ. It follows from [15] and Eqs. (5) that

$$E_c(\rho) - E_d(\rho) = h\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-p^2\sin^2 2\theta}\big) - h(p\sin^2\theta)$$
$$+h\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-4p\sin^2\theta + 4p^2\sin^2\theta}\big), \qquad (7)$$

which turns out to be strictly larger than zero unless $p = 0$ or 1. A simple approach to this inequality is by plotting Eqs. (7). Differing with the qualitative derivation (e.g., [4]), our result analytically shows that one can distill the same entanglement from ρ as $E_c(\rho)$ if and only if ρ is pure. The undistillable entanglement is explicitly given by Eqs. (7). It strongly supports the conjecture that entanglement distillation is irreversible in general [1].

Another proof for OD family containing different entanglement concerns an important state in QIT, the isotropic state $\rho_F = \frac{1-F}{d^2-1}I + \frac{Fd^2-1}{d^2-1}|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|, |\psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|ii\rangle$ [18]. It turned out that for ρ_F with $d = 3$ and $F > 8/9$, ε_{ρ_F} consists of a maximally entangled state and nine states ρ obtained by twirling and they are thus equivalently entangled, i.e., $E(\rho) = -1/3 + \log 3$ [10]. We prove that ε_{ρ_F} of high dimension $d, F > (4d-4)/d^2$ is similarly composed of $|\psi^+\rangle$ and many states ρ obtained by twirling, each of which contains entanglement $E(\rho) = \frac{2-d}{d}\log(d-1) + \log d$. This conclusion follows from the OD of ρ_F such that

$$\rho_F = \frac{d^2(1-F)}{(d-2)^2}\sum_{l=1}^{L}\frac{1}{L}|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| + \frac{4-4d+Fd^2}{(d-2)^2}|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|,$$

$$|\psi_l\rangle = \frac{d-2}{\sqrt{d^2-d}}\sum_{i=1}^{d}a_{li}|i\rangle\sum_{i=1}^{d}a_{li}^*|i\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-d}}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|ii\rangle. \quad (8)$$

We demonstrate the $L \times d$ coefficient matrix $[a_{li}]$ in the case of odd $d \geq 3$. We regard the $n \times 1$ vectors $\vec{a}_j, j = 1, ..., d$ as the nonzero entries in $[a_{li}]$, each "row" of which consists of $d+1/2$ nonzero entries and $d-1/2$ zero. The subscript of $\vec{a}_j$ marks its column in $[a_{li}]$. The first row of $[a_{li}]$ consists of $[\vec{a}_1, ..., \vec{a}_{d+1/2}, 0, ..., 0]$, the second $[\vec{a}_1, ..., \vec{a}_{d-1/2}, 0, \vec{a}_{d+3/2}, 0, ..., 0], ...,$ and the last $[0, ...0, \vec{a}_{d+1/2}, ..., \vec{a}_d]$. Counting all kinds of combinations, there are in all $\binom{d}{d+1/2}$ rows and hence $L = n\binom{d}{d+1/2}$. Each $\vec{a}_j$ has the form $(\sqrt{\frac{2}{d+1}}, \sqrt{\frac{2}{d+1}}e^{f_j\frac{2\pi}{n}i}, ..., \sqrt{\frac{2}{d+1}}e^{f_j\frac{2\pi}{n}(n-1)i})^T$, where the natural numbers f_j's are required to be $n|f_i + f_j - f_k - f_l$ if and only if $i = k, j = l$ or $i = l, j = k$. It can be done, e.g., by choosing $f_i = m^i, m > 1, n > 2m^d - 4$. One can deal with the case of even n similarly and verify Eqs. (8). So we have given the method of generating numerous ε_{ρ_F}, which is a remarkable character of the isotropic state. It makes ε_{ρ_F}

a much stronger OD family compared to the former results, when it is used to create the states with computable EOF by proposition 1. Specially, the EOF of any state in ε_{ρ_F} has the form $p(\frac{2-d}{d}\log(d-1)+\log d)+(1-p)\log d$ with the probability $p \in [0,1]$. In addition, the OD of ρ_F implies that one can generate the isotropic states by classically mixing the ensemble of MC states $\rho = p|\psi_l\rangle\langle\psi_l| + (1-p)|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$ obtained by twirling.

On the other hand there exist the states of high dimensions whose OD consists of equivalently entangled states, e.g., the Werner state ρ_w, which is important in QIT and has been extensively investigated [17, 21]. A $d\times d$ Werner state has the form $\rho_w = \frac{d-F}{d^3-d}I + \frac{d\ F-1}{d^3-d}\sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1}|ij\rangle\langle ji|$. The EOF of an entangled Werner state ($F \in [-1,0)$) has the analytical expression $E_f(\rho_w) = h(1/2+\sqrt{1-F^2}/2)$ [11]. From it we can derive the OD of ρ_w such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_w &= \tfrac{1}{2d^2-2d}\sum_{i>j=0}^{d-1}\sum_{k=0}^{3}|\psi_{ijk}\rangle\langle\psi_{ijk}|,\\
|\psi_{ijk}\rangle &= 2u_{k0}\sqrt{\tfrac{F+1}{2d+2}}|ii\rangle + 2u_{k3}\sqrt{\tfrac{1-F}{2}}\tfrac{|ij\rangle-|ji\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\\
&+2u_{k1}\sqrt{\tfrac{F+1}{2d+2}}|jj\rangle + 2u_{k2}\sqrt{\tfrac{(d-1)(F+1)}{2d+2}}\tfrac{|ij\rangle+|ji\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},\\
[u_{ij}] &= \begin{pmatrix} -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & -1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 \\ i/2 & i/2 & -1/2 & 1/2 \\ i/2 & i/2 & 1/2 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

One can easily verify the proposed OD which indeed gives rise to the Werner-OD family $\varepsilon_w = \{p_{ijk}, |\psi_{ijk}\rangle\}$, and each pure state $|\psi_{ijk}\rangle$ has identical amount of entanglement $E_f(\rho_w)$. It thus implies that the EOF of any state in ε_w is equal to $E_f(\rho_w)$, no matter how the probability distributions change. This is similar to the case of two-qubit states. We can use the Werner-OD family to construct more OD families with computable EOF by proposition 1. It is a new function of the Werner state. Moreover, one can check that any state $\sum_{ij} p_{ij}\rho_{ij} \in \varepsilon_w$ is negative partial transpose (NPT). This helps infer the EOF and irreversibility of NPT bound entangled states, if it really exists [22].

We notice that for each pair of fixed i, j, the state $\rho_{ij} \in \varepsilon_w$ is just a 2×2 Werner state ρ_{w0}. Such an OD is interesting in the sense that we can experimentally prepare a $d\times d$ Werner state by means of classically mixing many states ρ_{w0}'s up to unitary operations with identical probabilities p_{ij}'s, equivalently making a state ρ_{w0} go through the unital channel $\Lambda(\rho) = \frac{2}{d^2-d}\sum_{i>j=0}^{d-1} v_{ij}\otimes w_{ij}\rho_{w0}v_{ij}^{\dagger}\otimes w_{ij}^{\dagger}$. Here each pair of unitary operations v_{ij} and w_{ij} acts on a 2×2 space, so they can be indeed regarded as Pauli operations I and σ_x. As the state ρ_{w0} has been realizable [21], the proposed experiment is probably realizable by current techniques. More importantly, the experiment will verify that the $E_f(\rho_w)$ is indeed the minimal entanglement required to create a Werner state of high dimension.

To summarize, we have presented the OD method of deriving the EOF, additivity and entanglement cost for many states. Our method is flexible and could yield more results on entanglement measures. It also helps generate the Werner state and check the EOF experimentally.

We thank D. Yang for very useful discussions. The work was partly supported by the NNSF of China Grant No.90503009, No.10775116, and 973 Program Grant No.2005CB724508.

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, e-print quant-ph/0702225.

[2] C. H. Bennett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).

[3] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).

[4] K. G. H. Vollbrecht, R. F. Werner, and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062304 (2004).

[5] D. Yang, M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, and B. S. Radtke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 190501 (2005).

[6] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).

[7] S. P. Walborn, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, L. Davidovich, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, Nature(London) **440**, 1022 (2006); O. Gühne, M. Reimpell, and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 110502 (2007); J. Eisert, F. Brandão, and K. Audenaert, New J. Phys. **9**, 46 (2007).

[8] Y. Chen, Z. D. Wang, Y. Q. Li, and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 195113 (2007); A. Kopp and K. Le Hur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 220401 (2007); K. G. H. Vollbrecht and J. I. Cirac, *ibid.* **98**, 190502 (2007).

[9] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[10] B. M. Terhal, K. G. H. Vollbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2625 (2000); S. M. Fei and X. Li-Jost, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 024302 (2006).

[11] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062307 (2001).

[12] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Acta Phys. Slovaca **47**, 128 (1998).

[13] G. Vidal, W. Dür, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 027901 (2002); F. Yura, J. Phys. A **36**, 237 (2003).

[14] K. Matsumoto, T. Shimoto, and A. Winter, Comm. Math. Phys. **246**, 427 (2004).

[15] E. M. Rains, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 179 (1999); I. Devetak and A. Winter, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **461**, 207 (2005).

[16] P. Shor, Comm. Math. Phys. **246**, 453 (2004).

[17] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).

[18] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).

[19] P. Hayden, M. Horodecki, and B. Terhal, J. Phys. A **34**, 6891 (2001).

[20] We choose the form so that checking the entanglement-breaking channel [13] is easy.

[21] J. Lee and M. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4236 (2000); M. Barbieri, F. De Martini, G. Di Nepi, and P. Mataloni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 177901 (2004); M. Caminati, F. De Martini, R. Perris, F. Sciarrino, and V. Secondi, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 032312 (2006).

[22] D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062312 (2000).